## EXHIBIT 14 FILED UNDER SEAL

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                            MARSHALL DIVISION
                                      ( CAUSE NO. 2:22-CV-203-JRG
     NETLIST, INC.,
 3
                                     )
                Plaintiff,
 4
 5
     VS.
 6
     MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
                                     ) MARSHALL, TEXAS
     et al.,
                                      ( JULY 26, 2023
 7
                                     ) 9:00 A.M.
                Defendants.
 8
 9
10
11
                             MARKMAN HEARING
12
                    BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROY S. PAYNE
                      UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
                        SHAWN McROBERTS, RMR, CRR
                          100 E. HOUSTON STREET
                          MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670
23
                              (903) 923-8546
                    shawn mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov
24
25
```

2.0

2.1

2.2

And as we just discussed, the claim language doesn't use the term 'data port'; it just says there's an electrical communication to an array die.

THE COURT: You know, maybe I need to hear from the Plaintiff, then, because their briefing did not indicate the relationship that you're talking about, and I was not certain that in the argument that counsel for Plaintiff made in the last case that they were, in fact, saying that it is a limitation of the claim as opposed to an indication that the claim has been met.

Do you understand from your conversations with Plaintiff's counsel that they are contending that, in fact, the claim requires data ports as a limitation?

MR. RUECKHEIM: Not from conversations with opposing counsel, Your Honor. I sat in and watched the tail end of the Netlist v. Samsung trial, and so from observing what was argued there, that's where I understand that they were arguing to the jury what's shown here on the screen, and then also, Your Honor, in briefing in this case, Plaintiff has argued that 'electrical communication' requires even something more. There is an argument in the briefing that 'electrical communication' requires responsiveness. It says, "The above clear makes -- the above quotes"--they're citing to the specification, the intrinsic record here--it says that the electrical communication requires some kind of responsiveness.

| 1  | I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A   |
|----|--|
| 2  | CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF      |
| 3  | PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.  |
| 4  | I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE TRANSCRIPT FEES |
| 5  | FORMAT COMPLY WITH THOSE PRESCRIBED BY THE |
| 6  | COURT AND THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE   |
| 7  | UNITED STATES.                             |
| 8  |  |
| 9  | S/Shawn McRoberts 07/28/2023               |
| 10 | DATE<br>SHAWN MCROBERTS, RMR, CRR          |
| 11 | FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER            |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
|    |  |